AND ALL STREET, TORK TO THE TAXABLE TO THE TREET OF THE T

OFFICIAL CORRUPTION.

lost Romantic Narrative-The People against Sydney H. Stuart, City Judge. Before Judge Roosevelt.

MONDAY, Nov. 12.—The case of the people against Sydney H. Stuart, City Jucge, having been fixed for trial to-day, the courtroom was filled with anxious and in-terested spectators. The prosecution was confided to Mr. Francis B. Cutting—Mr. Hall, the district Attorney, not wishing to conduct it, as it was probable he should have to appear as a witness against the accused. Mr. Stuart was defended by Messre. James T. Brady, James R. Whiting and E. W. Stoughton. He sat behind his counsel

during the progress of the case.

The indictment against Mv Stuart charges, in substance, that the accused, in February 1865, in consideration of a bribe of \$500, interfered with the administration of justice in the case of an indictment sgainst one Wm. Cos-grove, and prevailed upon the Distric. Attorney, by the representations which he made to him in the matter, to enter a nolle proceeded to call the petty jury panel. The

first name called was that of Robert Beatty, examined by Mr. Cutting—Was recently candidate for the office of County Clerk; has formed no idea of the guitt or innocence of Mr. Stunet; his name is Robert Beatty, Jr., and his tather's Robert Beatty; the

the juror returned by the Commissioner.

To Mr. Brady—His tather's occupation and his own is

that of bookbinder; his own place of business is in Spruce street, and his father's in Chiff.

To the Court-My father's age is near seventy; his re sidence and place of business are different from mine.

Mr. Cutting referred to the City Directory, where he found both names given as Robert Beatty. He thought

it quite important, however, that in this case there who should compose the jury; and as this per-son had run for public office as Robert Beatty, Jr., and received votes under that designation, be thought the presumption was that the summons was intended for this man's father.

that, as Mr. Beatty's father was disqualified by age from serving on the jury, and as the summons was directed to this gentleman at his place of business, that he was the person intended by the Commissioner of Jurcers. Mr. Beatty was thereupon swern as a joror. John B. Wateran not objected to, and sworn as a

juror. Wm. F. Van Wagenen, challenged for principal cause and favor. Messrs. Beatty and Wateran were sworn a

Wm. F. Van Wagenen, challenged for principal cause and favor. Messrs. Beatty and Wateran were sworn as triers.

Mr. Van W. had read somewhat of this case; could not say he had not formed an opinion about the guilt or innocence of Mr. Stuart, but had expressed none.

To Mr. Cutting—Has no settled opinion in regard to this matter; less than usual in such cases; none that would prevent him giving an impartial verdict.

Challenge for principal cause overculed, and exception taken; examined on the challenge for favor. Has never served on a Grand Jury does not think that the fact of a bill of indictment having been found by a Grand Jury would weigh an item in the evidence at all; thinks there was some impression formed on his mind at the time he read the account of the case, out never felt more free in his life to try any ourse as he did to try this, although he should like very much to get off the jary; does not know the accused personally.

Challenged peremptority.

Challenged peremptority.

Challenged peremptority.

Challens S. Wright, examined on the challenge for principal cause—Has read and heard about this case; has formed and expressed impressions about the guit or innocence of the deceased, but they were more crude impressions.

To Mr. Catting—Have no knowledge of the facts in the

opinion.

To Mr. Brady—Distinguishes between impressions and opinions; has had an impression, nothing has occurred to remove it; it remains about the same.

Mr. Cutting—is any impression or opinion that you may have formed or expressed such as to disable you from list-ning to the evidence and making up your mind as to the guilt or innocease of the accured upon the evidence alone?

the guilt or innocence of the accused upon the evidence alone?

Objected to, and question argued.

Judge hoosevelt did not understand the rule on challenges for principal cause to extend further than to the fact of a juror having formed or expressed an opinion. The mere reception of an impression from reading a newspaper is no disqualification to a juror; if it did, it would be impossible, in an intelligent community like this, ever to get a jury.

Question allowed, and exception taken.

A. I could find a verdict altogether upon the evidence that may be given.

Challenge for principal cause overruled: exception taken, and witness examined on the challenge for favor.

Has served on the Grant Jury; knows the rule which governs that body; the fact of an indictanent being found against a man does not to a certa nty leave the impression on his mind that it was a case in which a petty jury would—without evidence to overthrow the prima Jacue case—convict; knows the accused for years, but has no personal acquaintance with him.

Challenger withdrawn, and Mr. Weight agreement in tree.

presume I could find a vertice tarbasely on the estate ac-aione.

To Mr. Whitney—I merely acquiesced in the opinion of the party with which I was conversing respecting the case; I remember what that opinion was; it stands now uppermost in my mind, and it would probably require some explanation to remove it.

Challenge for principal cause overruled, and exception taken; challenged for favor, and the principles of law bearing on the point argued at length by Messrs. Cutting and Brady.

Judge Roosevelt left the matter in the hands of the triers; they had the evidence before them; if they thought that he had impressions on the subject of the guilt or innecence of the accused which would affect his verdect, they would find the challenge true; otherwise they would find it not true.

The triers disagreed, one of them finding the challenge true and the other not true. This amounts to the chaltenge not being sustained, and the juror was challenged peremptorily.

Challenge overruled, and Mr. Peterson sworn as

James Boyd challenged for principal cause—Had read about this case, but had not formed or expressed an opinion about it; had not heard any person say anything as to what they thought about it; has no personal knowledge of Judge Stuart; knows nothing about the case, and has no impression about it either way.

Challenge overruled, and juror challenged peremptorily.

orily.

Elijah H. Riker challenged for principal cause; has exreased an opinion as to the guilt or innocence of Mr.

pressed an opinion as to the gunt or home.

Stuart.

To Mr. Cutting—Has read statements in the newspapers regarding the ascusation against Mr. Stuart, does not recollect reading anything else has heard it talked over; formed his opinion from what he had read and heard; cannot say that he ever heard anything about the facts; the statements which he had heard might influence his mind; thinks however he could reader an im-

artial verdict.

Judge Roosevelt thought it better to let this juror
tand aside, but did not mean to make this a precedent
in the contrary, if he found it impossible to get a jury,
would not consider that the tact of a man's having an
impression which would not influence his verdict is smill

he would not consider that the not of a man's having an impression which would not influence his verdict is sufficient to disqualify him.

Elward Green, challenged for principal cause.—Resides in Eighty-sixth street; does not know that he has formed any opinion as to the gullt or innocence of Judge Stuart; he had read the statement, and was surprised at it from his knowledge of the Judge; has known him for years, but not infimately.

Challenge overruled, and Mr. Green sworn as a juror, George Kingman, challenged for principal cause.—Resides in Montgomery street; has not read an account of the complaint against Judge Stuart; heard nothing particular about it; might have made or heard statements, but nothing to leave an impression particularly; has no biast challenge overruled, and juror challenged peremptority. Edward D. Jones, called and sworn, touching his completency,

Edward D. Jones, called and sworn, touching his competency.

Mr. Jones asked to be excused from serving, and stated it would be very inconvenient to him to remain here more than a day or two, as he kept the books of a large establishment, and he had but just returned from Wilmington, Del., where he had been as a witness, and his books were in great confusion.

Mr. Cutting would like much to excuse the gentleman; but every other gentleman on the jury list would be as justily entitled to like favor.

Mr. Jones, examined on the challenge for principal cause—Had read somewhat of this case; does not belong to the reform committee of this city, and does not mingle in polities at all; has formed no opinion as to the guilt or innocence of Mr. Stuart, does not know him.

Challenge overruled, and Mr. Jones challenged peremptorily.

sides in Greenwich street; is a carpenter and builder; has no particular acquaintance with this case of Judge Stu-art; read an account of it, but did not pay much atten-

tion to it; has no opinion one way or other; does not know Judge Stuart. Challenge overruled, and Mr. Concklin challenged pe-

know Judge stuart.

Challenge overruled, and Mr. Concklin challenged peremptorily.

Mr. Cutting insisted that the defeace having already made five peremptory challenges, they had exhausted their right of peremptory challenge. He was aware that in January, 1847, it has been decided by the Suprems Court that in any case wasre the punishment might extend to ten years' imprisonment, the defendant was entitled to twenty peremptory challenges. But in the same month the Legislature, being applied to, stepped in and corrected this misconstruction of the revised statutes, and in the act of 1847 declared that if the charge against the prisoner was such that in case of conviction he would be flable to imprisonment in the State prison for tea years or over, he should be retricted to five peremntery challenges. The case he referred to as having been decided by the Supreme Court, was that of Dunn against the reciple (4 Dvnio). He reas the statute of 1847 bearing on the subject, and submitted that in this case the defence was only emitted to five peremptory challenges.

Mr. Brady submitted that that was an act to increase, not to diminish the number of peremptory challenges.

Judge Roosevelt seemed to conscine with Mr. Brady in that view, and asked Mr. Cutting how he could get over the third section of the act, which provided that nothing therein anough the deemed to interfere with the rights of peremptory challenge theretofore existing.

The point was argued at some length, and the court decided that the defendant was entitled to twenty peremptory challenges.

Charles Berry, challeged for principal cause—is a pro-

Challenge overruied, and Mr. Berry challenged peremptorily.

George Burling, challenged for principal cause—Residesin Third street; read an account of the transaction in the newspapers, but formed no opinion at the time; supposes the charge to be true, and is still of that be lief; formed no opinion and had no impression as to the guilt or innocence of Judge Stuart; it would require some evidence to remove his belief as to the truth of the charge; read of it only once; has not been present when the subject was discussed.

To Mr. Cutting—Read merely in the paper that the charge was made against Judge Stuart; does not recollect reading any statement of facts, nor does ne know what they are; has formed no opinion as to the guilt or innocence of the accused; and can find a weddet just as the evidence may be.

To Mr. Whiting—Does not recollect reading the card of the District Attorney.

To the Court—I believed the truth of the statement that Judge Stuart was charged.

To Mr. Whiting—The statement that I read made no impression whatever on my mind as to the guilt or innocence of the accused.

Challenge withorawn, and Mr. Burling aworn as a juior.

Etward W. Baller, challenged for principal cause.—

juror.

Elward W. Baller, challenged for principal cause.—
Resides in Grand street; has not formed or expressed any
opinion to regard to the guilt or innocense of the accused; read of the indictment in the paper; did not read the
card of the libstriet Attorney; has no opinion about it
one way or other; has never been where the subject was
discussed.

remptorily.

John Davenport, challenged for principal cause.—
Thinks be read an account of the transaction in the
newspapers; fermed no opinion as to the guilt or innocence of the Judge; has no opinion or impression one

cence of the Judge; has no opinion or impression one way or other.

Challenge overruled, and Mr. Davenport challenged peremetorily.

Garret W. Ryckman, Jr., challenged for principal cause.—Resides in West Washington place; read nothing further than that Judge Stuart was indicted; formed no opinion as to his guilt or innocence; has not been present where the subject was discussed.

Challenge overruled, and Mr. Ryckman sworn as a jurcer.

Challenge overruled, and Mr. Ryckman sworn as a juror.

John Erdman challenged for principal cause; does not know Judge Stuart; has read part of the account, but did not pay much attention to it; never heard the subject discussed, and never formed an opinion about it one way or other.

Challenge overruled and Mr. Erdman challenged peremptorily.

William Hubbard challenged for principal cause; read a statement of the case in the newspapers; should say that it had made no impression on him, and that he had no opinion as to the guilt or innocence of Judge Stuart.

Challenge overruled and Mr. Hubbard challenged peremptorlly.

emptorily.

Luman R. Wing, challenged for principal cause—Resides in Monroe street; has not termed or expressed any opinion as to the guilt or it nosence of the accused; has no read any accounts of the transaction.

Challenge overruled and Mr. Wing challenged percemptorily.

Challenge overruled and Mr. Wing challenged percemptority.

George G. Taylor challenged for principal cause.—Has not formed or expressed any opinion in this case.

Challenge withdrawn, and Mr. Taylor sworn as a juror.

John S. Rockwool challenged for principal cause.—Read an account of the indictment being found against Judge Stuart; does not recollect reading the card of the bistrict Altorney in this case; formed an opinion ag to the guilt or innoceace of the accused, which perhaps might take some evidence to remove; that opinion still remains.

To Mr. Cutting—Read nothing and know nothing of the facts in the case; has not made up an opinion on the facts in the case; has not made up an opinion on the facts in the case; The persons whom he heard discussing the question about Mr. Stuart receiving a bribe did not express an opinion as to his guilt or innoceace.

To Mr. Cutting—The fact of an indictment having been found leaves a prejudice on my mind; there is nothing else to prejudice my mind; would find a verifiet according to the evidence.

To the Court—Has no settled or distinct opinion as to the guilt or innoceace of the accused, any further than

the guilt or innocence of the accused, any further than that an indictment was found against him. Challenge overroled, and juror challenged for favor.

Challenge overruled, and juror challenged for favor. Counsel argued the matter before the triers, and the triers found the challenge true.

Wm. B. Robinson challenged for principal cause—never read or beard any account of this transaction; knows the Judge by sight but is not personally acquirated with him.

Challenge overruled, and Mr. Robinson challenged peremptorily.

Wm. B. Rogers, challenged for principal cause—Read an account of this transaction; cannot say that he formed any opinion or entertained any impression as to the guilt or innocence of the accused; cannot say that he ever heard the subject discussed.

Challenge overruled and Mr. Rogers challenged peremptorily.

Challenge overruses and the principal cause—Never heard or read of this case before, does not know Judge Stuart at all; has no opinion about it; mgth have the impression that a Grand Jury would not find a bill of indictment against him without cause.

Challenge overruled and Mr. King challenged peremptorily.

torily.

I saw Koch, challenged for principal cause—Had heard the case talked about a good deal; did not hear people express opinions about it; did not express any himself does not think about the matter whether Judge Stuart is guilty or not; heard people speak rather against him; believed part of what they said; has so much doubt about him that he thought there would not be an indiciment against the gentleman unless there was something against him.

him.

Juror allowed to stand aside.

William Glover, challenged for principal cause—Had
seen in the papers that an indictment had been found
against Judge Stuart, did not see the card of the Diatrict
Attorney, must have heard the matter talked about more
or less; has not formed any opinion about it, nor has any
impression.

or less; has not formed any opinion about it, nor has any impression.

Challenge overruled and the juror challenged for favor—Has not served on a Grand Jury; has a belief that if a Grand Jury finds a bill of indictment they must have had evidence enough before them.

Mr. Brady called upon the Court to instruct the triers that such a belief on the mind of a petit juror disqualifies thin from serving.

being found, but I would render it solely on the evidence and law.

Counsel argue: the point before the Court and triers. Judge Rooseveit declined to charge specifically the point asked by Mr. Brady, and exception was taken.

The triers found the challenge no true, and the juror was challenged peremptority.

Judge Rooseveit notified counsel that he would require them to present in the morning this class of their exceptions and the evidence.

Mr. Brady stated it would be impossible for counsel to comply with this order; and it was agreed that they should do so in proper time.

Jacob L. Scisza, challenged for principal cause—Read the statement of the indictment of Justice Stuart; formed no opinion about it; recollect no particular instance of having heard any conversation on the subject the fact of a Grand Jury having found an indistment would not have the slightest indicence upon his mind.

Challenge withdrawn, and Mr. Scizza sworn as a juror.

Daniel Cashman, challenged for p neipal cause—Has formed or expressed no opinion about the case; is not acquainted with Judge Stoart.

Challenge overruied, and Mr. Cashman sworn as a juror.

Alance T. Briggs also sworn as a uror.

aror.
Alanso T. Briggs also sworn as a uror.
Joseph Logan—Had heard or read nothing of this mater, and had no opinion one way or other.
Challenge overuled, and Mr. Logan challenged peremposity

Job Long had not read or heard of this matter, and had formed no opinion about it.
Challenged peremptorily.
John Fritz had not heard about the case; he did not bother himself about such things; did not know what Judge Staart is charged with; had no opinion about the case in any way.
Challenged peremptorily.
James R. Hoyt answered, and was excussed from serving on account of the illness of his daughter.
Joseph T. Heddon had formed and expressed an opinion as to the guilt or innecence of Judge Staart.
To Mr. Cutting.—He knew nothing about the facts; had only seen in the papers that Judge Staart had been indicted; does not know that he has formed any settled opinion further than that the Grand Jury would not find an indictment unless there was reason for it; he might, but could not say positively that he would render an impartial verdict solely on the evidence; he would rather Jaror allowed to stand aside.

Indiffy rater was Bot and all asset on the salpect, he had formed no particular opinion these could not be remote and the property of the prop

wardsthe close of the day, into the office of the District Attorney, Mr. Hall who was then busily engaged in his private office. Judge Stuart, as one of the Judges of the Court, was, of course, intimate with the District Attorney, and had the right of entrance at all times into his office. He come in and sat down. He saw that Mr. Hall was exceedingly busy, being engaged in the preparation of some arguments in which he was to take part, and which was shortly to come on. Nevertheless, some casual conversation occurred between them relative to the courts and to the case of Mr. Peverelly, who had been then secently indicted on a charge of arson, in having set fire to his store. This was the case which Mr. Hall had then before him, and in the preparation of which he was engaged. After some little conversation, Stuart stated to Mr. Hall that he whished to procure the entering of a noile process of a noile process on an old indictment against a man who wished to lead an honest life and to get rid of the charge then pending over sim; and he acced that the winesses against him were all gone. Mr. Hall asked him, in substance, whether it was a proper case for a discharge to the indictment, and Mr. Stuart answered that there was nothing in the indictment, nothing in the case at all. Mr. Hall told him that he was very busy at that moment, and could not then go into Court—because, gentlemen, in order to obtain a noile process; it is necessary for the listrict Attorney to go into Court and move the Judge for liberty to enter a noile process; in many of the listrict Attorney to go into Court and move the Judge for liberty to enter a noile process; in many of the court from; it was a methy process; in an ending the him that there was nothing in the indictment, Mr. Hall said, "I am very busy at its list the puty Clerk—and that he (the Judge) would rest and consider it precisely as if it were a motion made before him before the District Attorney's making that motion, he would write a note to "John"—meaning John Sparks, the Peputy an old case and nothing in it, he book is nor grames that it was a minor case of no sort of consequence, and so he prepared to write this note to Sparks. He then asked Mr. Stuart what time this indictment was found. Stuart could not tell him the precise date, but supposed it was somewhere in the year 1852 or 1852. On that Mr. Hall wrote a short memorandum to Mr. Sparks, directing him to enter a soile proteops as to Mr. Connoily, who had been indicted about May, 1852, or 1853, by request of Judge Stuart. He incorporated this in his note to Sparks. "Let Judge Stuart," he said, "make the proper early, and Mr. Hall will sign it." This note, thus addressed to Sparks, Mr. Hall delivered to Stuart, who immediately let the office. Now, you will observe, gentlemen, that in respect to Cogrove it was a case of which Stuart knew everything—it was one which he had pronounced to be of so grave a character as to require an unusually heavy ball, and which ball he had only consented to reduce to 35,000, on the urgent srgument of Mr. Smith the counsel for Cogrove. Judge Stuart came into office, as I have said, on the lat of January, 1855. He held court and was the precising criminal magistrate of this city in Fonourary, 1856. He was holding court on the 19th of February. He left the bench toward the close of that day, and went into the office of the Bistrict Attorney. He introduced a conversation, an made an appeal to Mr. Hall to assist in entering noile prosequic as its usen who desired to reform, and for that purpose to give date of an indictment. He said that his name was Wm. Connoily, and being asked what wa the nature and character of the offence, he assured this bit name was desirable to the body of making this name was desirable to a morion in open court, the note was written by Mr. Hall, and Stuart received in the next stage, geutlemen, to which the case leads to the office, and a very reliable clerk of this Court the note was evidenced in the office. Stuart way and came date is the office of the Clerk. Mr. Stuart imms d

ment against Coegrove, and feund it; it was an indictment against him for burglary in the first degree. After the indictions in having been found, Mr. Stuart desired very much to have an order entered on the munues of the court dismissing this indictions. Mr. Vandervort, however, desired first of all to see Mr. Hall, because have controlled in the court of the have an order of the have an order on the back of the indictment in the usual way. Mr. Vandervoort having and the wanted to have Mr. Hall's engalars on the back of the indictment in the usual way. Mr. Vandervoort having Mr. dall's offer, but that gentleman bad left at the time. He came back and found Judge Stuart very anxious to obtain a certified, copy of the order. Mr. Vandervoort having Mr. dall's onte and seeing Judge Stuart, the Judge of the court, ar gent for the croier, and on has assurance that the in lifet ment against Coegrove was the indictment meant and in tended, directed Mr. Sparks to take from the book activated in the Judge Stuart, who then left the office with Mr. Ballied copy in his pocket, but without Mr. Why, this, 'said be, 'ils an indictment against Mr. Coagrove. "Yes," said Mr. Vandervoort, "Judge Stuart said that that was the indictment within was to be not joresti." "Why, this, 'said be, 'ils an indictment against Mr. Coagrove. "Yes," said Mr. Hall, "this is a different case. My note better to Mr. Coanolly; and this is the case of Mr. Co.grove, a man who is indicted a suit is the case of Mr. Co.grove, a man who is indicted for burglary in the first degree. An othermic officers—a man known to the public by the name of firsted Bill." "Well, 'ways Mr. Vandervoort, on the remarks of the Judge. "the mole process of the manual control of the minute of th

recollection—on the evening of the 17th of February, and he then told her that he had got what was necessary to clear her husband, but that he had left the papers down town. He told her, however, that she need not wait as he would give her what was necessary, and all that there would be necessary for the purpose of clearing her husband; on that he sat down and drew up a paper or a certificate in relation to her husband's being dhechanged from this indlement: he dated it and handed it to Mrs. Cosgrove, but also objected to it on the ground that it seemed to be very informal; it did not seem to be enough; it did not satisfy her that there was any act of the Court about it. I think, though I am not confident, that she remarked as to the date being the 19th instead of the 17th. He took that paper and fore it up, and then wrote another paper which he handed to Mrs. Cosgrove, and to which she again made some objection; but he told her that it was entirely sufficent, that he had left the Court papers and would send to her, by mail, a certified copy of the order. He thereupen handed to her a paper which he had signed as City Judge, as follows:—

"CTY AND COUNTY OF NEW YORK.

"This is to certify, that on the motion of the District Attorney, of said city and county, a nolle processi was this day ordered and entered of record by the Court of General Sessions of the peace in and for the city and county sforesaid, in the matter of the indictment against Wm. Connolly, discharging the said indictment, and dismissing the complisat and accusation found and preferred against him in the month of April, 1853."

And then as an a iditional certificate and to satisfy Mrs. Connolly, who had objected to the insufficiency and informality of the first, he appended the following:—

"There being now no mideiment in said Court against the said Countey for any criminal offence whatever.

This certificate he handed to her; she left the next day for Philiadelphis, and in due course afterwards, she received, or Connolly received, a letter from

the Peace.

"New City Hall, Feb. 19, 1855,

"The People against William Cogrove—indictment for burglary in the first degree.

By leave of the Court, the District Attorney entered a nolle procession in this indictment. Or dered that the defendant be discharged therefrom.

Extract from the minutes.

"H. VANDERVOORT, Clerk.

Control of the Control of Common of Security Control of Control of

and Mr. Horses F. Clark, the counsel engaged to deleted Lewis Paker for the murder of Wm. Fords, shipsel agreed to fix the trial of Baker for Housiny, Nov. 19.

New York Election.
THE RESULT IN THE STATE—THE NEW CANAL SOARS—THE ELECTION OF PLAGO, ETC., ETC.
As the more reliable accounts come in, the Knew Nothing plurality seems to increase. According to the latest returns they are nearly lifteen thousand sheed of the black resultiess, and with each thousand of the the black republicans, and within eight thousand of the democratic hard and soft vote combined. The following are the latest figures:-

| Sec. of State, 1855. | Sec. of State, 1855. | Clark, whig. | 156,861 | Fing fusion. | 84,911 | Ullman, K. N. | 122,282 | Headley, K. N. | 99,728 | Seymour, soft. | 156,495 | Hatch, soft. | 65,138 | Brenson, hard. | 53,850 | Ward, hard. | 42,905 Total THE CANAL BOARD.

The anxiety of the public in regard to State fix somewhat relieved by the result of the recent election.

The following will constitute the two boards, who will have charge of the canals after the lat of January,

COMMUNICATION OF THE CANAL FEAD Henry J. Raymond . Lieut. Governor . Joel T. Headley . Secretary of State it Lorenzo Burrows . Comptroller . R. Stephen Glark . Treasurer . K. Stephen B. Cushiog . Attorney General . K.

1854. SENATE. ASSEMBLY.

Know Nothings 33 Know Nothings Whigs 66 Republicans Democrats 29 Democrats Total 128 Total JUSTICES OF SUPERME COURT ELECTRO.

1st district—James R. Whiting, (long term.) dem.

—Henry E. Davies, (short term.) K. N.

—James Emott, rep.

4th ——E. B. Resckrans, (long term.) K. N.

—A. C. Paigs, (short term.) dem.

5th ——Wilkiam F. Allen, dem.

6th ——Hanson Balcom, rec.

7th ——E. Davien Smith, K. N.

8th ——Hichard P. Marvin, K. N.

THE ELECTION OF PLAGE. Azariah C. Flagg is re-elected Comptroller by 162 plu rality over Giles, the Know Nothing candidate.

Brooklyn City Election.

METING OF THE BOARD OF CANVASSUM.

The Brooklyn Common Council met as a Board of Comvasers /yeaterday afternoon, Mayor Hall presiding, and declared the following charter officers as having received.

the highest number of votes, and therefore elected:-

the highest number of votes, and therefore circled with the surprivators.

Wards.

Wards.

1—Wm. Hinman, dem.
10—Samuel Sulth, dem.
11—James Sidler, dem.
3—John J. Studwell, whig.
4—Franklin Thomas, K. N.
12—Wm. Wall, whig.
5—Forster Pettit, ind dem.
14—F. C. Batterman, dem.
15—Wm. Marshall, dem.
16—John Cashaw, whig.
10—Ephraim B. Shaw, dem.
11—Wm. W. Walsh, K. N.
12—Tritick O'Neil, dem.
14—John Sult. Worlam, Rep.
14—John Sult. Worlam, Rep.
14—John Sunyler, whig.
15—Wm. I. Mills, dem.
16—Edwin S. Ralphs, dem.
16—Edwin S. Ralphs, dem.
18—M. Ralphs, dem.
19—M. Ralphs

words.

Wards.

11—Reuben Isdell.

13—John Tenny.

15—Joseph T. Mitter.

17—Amos W. Nikwer 1 - George N. Mead. 3 - Robert J. Luckey. 5 - Charles Ferrigan. 7 - Caspar Urban. 9 - Bernard D'Neit.

Forth,

1.—Henry Onkey,

2.—James A. Birdsall,

3.—John Burrall,

4.—John Adair,

6.—Win, W. Randolph,

7.—James M'Clurey,

8.—Win, P. Williams,

9.—Charles Lud'ey,

CAPTAINS,

Interior World.
10—Christ, C. Ryder.
11—Alfred Horton.
12—John R. Cerr.
13—James T. Marsh.
14—Owen Fennin.
15—Afred H. Mills.
15—John Klineline.
17—Hiram Besvis.
18—Joob Morris.
00 roller.

The officers named were declared elected, and the Board of Conveners adjourned. News from Venezuela

acr in the Country-Milder Sway of Monagas-He Con ediates his Enemies. In Thousand People Dead of Ch. lera-Coffee and other Markets-Beath of an Estitor. We avail ourselves of this opportunity to drop you a

communicate. present of revolutionary movements, the President apmeasures of administration, and shows increased favor towards his late enemies by employing many in the civil service. It is apparent that there does not exist so much bitter feeling between the parties as formerly, in conse-

whether he is sincere in his promises.

We have to lament the great ravages occasioned by the we have to tainent the great ravages occasionally of the country say, Caracas, La Guayra, Puerto Cabello, Valencia, Victoria Turmero, Maracay, Valleys of the Tuy, Barzusimeto, &c., &c. its presence in Valencia and same other places has been and

presence in Valencia and some other places has been and continues to be dreadfully afflicting. Probably not less than 19.060 have fallen victims throughout the country since its appearance, which is a large mortality taking into consideration the sparse population.

The effect which has been produced by this awful calamity upon business transactions is carredy to be imagined. Nothing is doing of consequence.

No American vessel in port.

Hides are selling to day at 1855c. Coffee none. The new crop of coffee has not yet commenced to arrive in market. Until January February and March next the principal part cannot be expected from the interior. Cotton, 125c. indigo, 8 reals per lb. F. fuetic, 200 a 22 per ten. lignumwith, 210 a 214 per ten, cocca, 227 50 a 221 per ten. lignumwith, 210 a 214 per ten, cocca, 227 50 a 221, inferior classes.

From Caracas we learn of the decesse by choisers of signor Jose Maria de Rejas, a gentleman well known as the able editor of the Liberal published in that city for many years. He was highly respected by all.

A man named Adam Wertel, by occupation a stage-liver, was taken into custody a few days ago, by officer driver, was taken into custody a few days ago, by officer I noteratilier, of the Eighth ward police, on charge a grand larceny and attempt at house robbery. The accuracy, it is alleged slyly entered the dwelling house. No 406 Broome street, and managed to carry off an overcost valued at \$50, and the keys of the outside doors. The fact of the occurrence being communicated to (apt Turnbull, of the Eighth ward police is, (calculating that the third would return with the keys, or as to obtain an entrance to the premises,) detailed officer Universities to watch the premises for a few days. After several days close observation, Westel, it is alleged much his appearance, and endeavured to effect an entrance into the house. On being arguedad, he was enarched, when the missing overcost and lays were discovered to be in the possession of the principe. He was committed for trial by Justice Pearsy.

CHARGE OF ILLEGAL VOTING.

voting. The accused, it is alleged, bousted to the officer that he had voted at the first election poil district of

CITIES IN ILLINOIS.—The city of Peoria is the second city in the State, numbering 11, 205 cities. The value of her manufactures is set down at \$1,120,470, five stock, \$251,870, Quincy has a population of 11.754 Value of manufactures, \$1,091,909, the stock, \$148,000.